1	LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP			
2	DANA ALDEN FOX, SB# 119761 E-Mail: Dana.Fox@lewisbrisbois.com			
3	BARRY HASSENBERG, SB# 71136 E-Mail: Barry.Hassenberg@lewisbrisbois.com			
4	RYAN D. HARVEY, SB# 204319 E-Mail: Ryan.Harvey@lewisbrisbois.com 633 West 5 <sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 4000			
5	633 West 5 <sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 4000 Los Angeles, California 90071			
6	Los Angeles, California 90071 Telephone: 213.250.1800 Facsimile: 213.250.7900			
7	Attorneys for Defendant COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES			
8				
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
10	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, WESTERN DIVISION			
11				
12	STAR SAI	AZAR, et al.,	CASE NO. 2:15-cv-09003-MWF (JCx)	
13	Plaintiffs,		The Hon. Michael W. Fitzgerald	
	VS.		The Holl. Whenael W. Httzgerald	
14			JOINT STATUS REPORT	
15	COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, AND DOES 1-10, et al.,		T'.1D. ( N C. (	
16	Defendants.		Trial Date: None Set	
17				
18				
19	Pursuant to this Court's May 4, 2017 Order, the parties hereby submit the			
20	following joint status report.			
21	I. <u>RELATED CASES</u>			
22	There are five related lawsuits, all proposed class actions, against counties in			
23	southern California concerning the same set of claims. The related cases are:			
24	A.	A. Salazar v. County of Los Angeles, CV 15-09003 MWF (JCx)		
25	B. Alarid v. County of San Bernardino, CV 16-01079 MWF (JCx)			
26	C. Kaelin v. County of Riverside, CV 16-02477 MWF (JCx)			
27	D. Bohanon v. County of Orange, CV 16-02478 MWF (JCx)			
28	E. Gallardo v. County of Ventura, CV 16-02479 MWF (JCx)			
	4839-8793-5303.1		1	

JOINT STATUS REPORT

& SMITH LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW

## II. PRIOR STAY ORDER

This Court previously dismissed the state law claims without prejudice and Plaintiffs refiled them in state court. On January 27, 2017 this Court stayed proceedings in the five above-referenced federal actions until the resolution of the state law cases.

## III. STATUS REPORT

The five state court complaints filed against the counties of Los Angeles, San Bernardino, Riverside, Orange and Ventura were coordinated along with four additional complaints against the counties of Alameda, Santa Clara, Contra Costa and San Mateo (collectively the "Coordinated State Cases"). The Coordinated State Cases were assigned to Los Angeles County Superior Court Judge Carolyn B. Kuhl, and Judge Kuhl held a status conference in the Coordinated State Cases on May 8, 2017.

At the status conference the parties informed the court they believe a case that was then pending before the California Supreme Court, *Jacks v. City of Santa Barbara* 234 Cal. App. 4th 925 (2015), petition for review granted S225589, may have a significant bearing on the California Constitution, Article XIII-C and XIII-D issues. The parties asked the court to defer the deadline for filing motions and/or responsive pleadings until the California Supreme Court issued its opinion in the *Jacks* case. The court agreed and ordered the Plaintiffs to file a consolidated complaint in the Coordinated State Cases after the *Jacks* opinion was issued.

The court further ordered the parties to thereafter meet-and-confer to agree on a deadline when Defendants' responsive pleadings would be due, and to agree on a briefing schedule should Defendants elect to file demurrers and/or other motions challenging the sufficiency of Plaintiffs' consolidated complaint. The court scheduled a further status conference for January 16, 2018.

The California Supreme Court issued its opinion in the *Jacks* case on June 29, 2017, but the plaintiffs in that case have filed a petition for rehearing.

The Plaintiffs in the Coordinated State Cases filed their consolidated complaint on July 21, 2017. Defendants are in the process of reviewing the consolidated

complaint and analyzing it in light of the Jacks opinion, and the parties will then meet-1 and-confer to address the issues ordered by Judge Kuhl. Defendants anticipate filing a 2 3 consolidated demurrer and/or other motions to resolve the legal issues presented by Plaintiffs' consolidated complaint in the Coordinated State Cases. 4 5 IV. REQUESTED ORDER The parties request the court to continue the stay of the federal cases until the 6 issues concerning all of the state law claims are resolved by the state court. During the 7 8 pendency of the stay the parties will continue to submit joint status reports to this Court every 90 days unless otherwise ordered by this Court. 9 **10** DATED: July 31, 2017 RAPKIN & ASSOCIATES, LLP 11 12 13 Scott B. Rapkin By: /s/ 14 Scott B. Rapkin 15 Attorneys for Plaintiffs 16 17 DATED: July 31, 2017 LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP **18** 19 **20** Ryan D. Harvey By: sRyan D. Harvey 21 Attorneys for Defendant 22 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES 23 24 I certify that all counsel to this joint status report have authorized its filing. 25 <u>Ryan D. Harvey</u> **26** Ryan D. Harvey 27



28

4839-8793-5303.1